

DURIE TANGRI LLP  
Daralyn J. Durie (SBN 169825)  
ddurie@durietangri.com  
217 Leidesdorff Street  
San Francisco, California, 94111  
+1 (415) 362-6666  
+1 (415) 236-6300 facsimile

*Attorneys for Orange, S.A.*

FOLEY HOAG LLP  
Daniel Schimmel (*pro hac vice*)  
dschimmel@foleyhoag.com  
1540 Broadway, 23rd Floor  
New York, New York, 10036  
+1 (646) 927-5500  
+1 (646) 927-5599 facsimile

Anthony Mirenda (*pro hac vice*)  
amirenda@foleyhoag.com  
Seaport West  
155 Seaport Boulevard  
Boston, MA 02210  
+1 (617) 832-1220  
+1 (617) 832-7000 facsimile

*Attorneys for Defendants*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

TELESOCIAL, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORANGE S.A., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:14-cv-03985-JD

**DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF MOTION  
AND MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 1 TO  
PRECLUDE PLAINTIFF FROM  
CHARACTERIZING A JULY 2012  
PRESENTATION TO FACEBOOK AS  
IMPROPER**

Final Pretrial Conference: March 23, 2017  
Ctmm: 11, 19th Floor  
Judge: Honorable James Donato  
Trial: April 10, 2017

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, at a time and date set by the Court, Defendants Orange S.A. and all individual defendants (collectively, the “Orange Defendants”) will and hereby do move *in limine* pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b) and Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 403, and 404 to preclude Plaintiff Telesocial (“Telesocial”) from presenting evidence or argument characterizing the inclusion of a Telesocial screenshot in a July 2012 Orange presentation to Facebook as improper in any way.<sup>1</sup> This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion and Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities included herewith, the supporting Declaration of Anthony Mirenda, all pleadings and papers on file in this action, and such further evidence, argument, and exhibits that may be submitted to the Court at or before the hearing.

In its order on the Orange Defendants’ motion to dismiss, this Court held that the Orange Defendants’ *forum non conveniens* argument did not apply because Telesocial’s claims in the First Amended Complaint did “not fall within the scope of the forum selection clause.” (Docket No. 85 at 4). Notably, the forum selection clause that was included in the Non-Disclosure Agreement (the “NDA”) would have sited this dispute in France. Analyzing each of Telesocial’s claims, and relying on Telesocial’s express representations, the Court concluded that each claim concerned only conduct *after* the termination of the NDA.<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., *id.* at 5 (“As the facts alleged in the FAC make clear, this claim [under the CFAA] is premised entirely upon events that occur after the abrupt termination of the discussions subject to the NDA.”) Despite the clear import of the Court’s order that Telesocial’s claims apply only to conduct *after* the termination of the NDA, Telesocial has nonetheless, throughout discovery, hearkened back to conduct *during* the period

<sup>2</sup> It is Telesocial's position that the NDA terminated with the end of negotiations in July 2012. It is Orange's position that the NDA did not terminate then and in fact continued beyond the fall of 2012, covering Orange's conduct in that time period as well. Nothing herein shall be taken as a waiver of Orange's arguments concerning the termination of the NDA, and instead Orange expressly preserves them.

1 governed by the NDA. In particular, Telesocial has characterized Orange's inclusion of a  
2 screenshot of Telesocial's Call Friends application in a July 2012 presentation to Facebook as  
3 being some illicit taking and misuse of Telesocial's confidential information shared during the  
4 period of the parties' negotiations—exactly the subject-matter covered by the NDA. *See, e.g.*,  
5 Exhibit 2 to Mirenda Decl. (Catherine Le Drogo Tr. 202-222) (Telesocial's counsel asking, at  
6 208:2-4, "And again, we see a screenshot provided on this page, which was pulled—which is a  
7 Telesocial screenshot, right?" and later, at 216:11-12, "Where does the word 'Telesocial' appear  
8 on page 6053?"). This has occurred with no fewer than three Orange witnesses at deposition.

9         Given the Court's ruling on the motion to dismiss, and Telesocial's affirmative arguments  
10 to the Court that the allegations in its First Amended Complaint pertained only to the period after  
11 the termination of the NDA, Telesocial should be estopped from arguing alleged improper conduct  
12 that reaches-back to the period before the NDA's termination.

13         The Orange Defendants anticipate that Telesocial will seek to characterize the presentation  
14 to Facebook, specifically a Telesocial screenshot in it, as improper and ill-gotten. This  
15 characterization is irrelevant to the claims in dispute, and Telesocial should be precluded from  
16 suggesting in any way that Orange inappropriately gained access to or misused information during  
17 the parties' negotiations. If Telesocial is allowed to characterize Orange's presentation to  
18 Facebook in this manner, there will be substantial prejudice to Orange, confusion of the issues that  
19 are appropriate for the jury's consideration, and a time-intensive mini trial on a subject – whether  
20 or not Orange's use of this screenshot in July 2012 was permissible under the NDA – this Court  
21 has already found is outside the claims alleged by Telesocial.

22         Orange would be unduly prejudiced by any suggestion of impropriety under the NDA,  
23 including the content of the presentation to Facebook. Fed. R. Evid. 403, *see United States v.*  
24 *Blackstone*, 56 F.3d 1143, 1146 (9th Cir. 2005) ("[U]nfair prejudice in the context of balancing  
25 evidence means an undue tendency to suggest decision on an improper basis commonly, though  
26 not necessarily, an emotional one."). Knowing it cannot litigate the issue of a supposed violation  
27 of the NDA directly, Telesocial must be precluded from injecting the issue indirectly, implanting  
28

1 the subject firmly in the minds of the jurors, who, despite having no claim under the NDA before  
2 them, will have heard the suggestion, often coded and subtle, that Orange gained access to  
3 information that was protected or confidential during the period of the parties' negotiations and  
4 then misused it. This is exactly the proscription of Rule 404, in that Telesocial suggests that  
5 Orange's use of this document during the negotiations was somehow improper and is now relevant  
6 to whether Orange engaged in misconduct after the negotiations ended. Fed. R. Evid. 404(b)(1).

7 Exclusion is also warranted where there is "danger of confusing the issues and wasting  
8 time with mini-trials regarding the events underlying" entirely different claims than those alleged  
9 at trial. *United States v. Jones*, 123 F. App'x 773, 775 (9th Cir. 2005). Telesocial has no claims  
10 under the NDA, and yet its improper characterization of conduct during the period of the NDA  
11 would significantly complicate the jurors' decision-making by introducing another potential legal  
12 framework that this Court has already determined does not apply to the issues in this case. If  
13 alleged misconduct under the NDA crept into testimony at trial, then Orange would be forced  
14 to introduce evidence at trial that there was no breach under the NDA—a 'mini trial' on an issue  
15 that has already been put to rest. "These 'mini-trials' pose the risk of unfair prejudice, are likely  
16 to confuse the issues, mislead the jury, and waste time." *Thuy Van v. Language Line Servs.*, No.  
17 14-3791, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85620, at \*8-9 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2016). Ultimately, Telesocial  
18 should not be allowed to go through the back door when the front door has been closed. The Court  
19 determined, based on arguments made by Telesocial and amendments to its complaint that  
20 removed all reference to the NDA, that Telesocial's claims pertained only to conduct after the  
21 termination of the NDA. It cannot now seek to reintroduce this same conduct by implication,  
22 suggestion, or characterization.

### 23 CONCLUSION

24 For all the foregoing reasons, the Orange Defendants respectfully request that the Court  
25 grant this Motion and preclude Telesocial from characterizing the inclusion of a Telesocial  
26 screenshot in Orange's presentation to Facebook as improper in any way.

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 ORANGE, S.A., et al.

3 By their attorneys,

4 Daniel Schimmel (*pro hac vice*)

5 Anthony Mirenda (*pro hac vice*)

6 /s/ Anthony D. Mirenda

7 Anthony D. Mirenda

8 FOLEY HOAG LLP

9  
10 Dated: February 23, 2017

11  
12 FILER'S ATTESTATION

13 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), regarding signatures, I, Daralyn J. Durie, attest that  
14 concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained.

15 /s/ Daralyn J. Durie

16 Daralyn J. Durie  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28